

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 13-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 19, and 29 are independent.

The undersigned would like to thank Examiners Xu and Zimmerman for the cordial and productive interview of December 20, 2007. The Examiners' helpful comments and suggestions were instrumental in preparing this response.

Applicants have added new Claims 13-29 to afford themselves a scope of protection commensurate with the disclosure. The new claims are fully supported in the specification (see the "Linked Video Files" section of the substitute specification; paragraphs [0053] *et seq* in the sub spec; paragraphs [0061] *et seq* in the published application), and are believed to be allowable for the reasons to be developed below.

Claims 1-5 and 11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rangan, Feinleib, Toyama, Vidovic, and Toklu, for the reasons noted at pages 2-10 of the Office Action. The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Xu for the detailed discussion of the art as applied to the claims. Such a detailed analysis is very helpful in preparing this response. Applicants respectfully traverse all art rejections.

As discussed at the interview, each of independent Claims 1, 19, and 29 recites a novel/non-obvious combination of structure and function whereby an image processing system processes video content in a sequence of video frames, and links one or more pixel objects embedded in the video content to selected data objects in a sequence of video frames. Notably, the video linking system samples the video content at ***a sample rate which is a multiple of plural standard playback rates***. In the disclosed embodiments, the sampling rate is 3 FPS, which is a multiple of standard frame rates such as: NTSC, 30 FPS, PAL, 15 FPS, 12 FPS, and the movie content disclosed in the application (known to be 24 FPS).

In contrast, none of the art cited in the case (including Rangan, Feinleib, Toyama, Vidovic, and Toklu) discloses or suggests such a combination of features. Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that the pending claims are fully patentable over the cited art.

As also discussed at the interview with respect to Claims 2 and 3, the person of ordinary skill in the art would not think to combine Rangan with Vidovic. While Rangan relates to the subject matter of the present application, Vidovic is directed to ensuring the smooth merging of two video frames in a video tape-editing system. It has nothing to do with tracking pixel objects in video content. The pulses disclosed in Fig 17

of Vidovic are control pulses supplied by a control circuit in order to merge the phases of the two video frames, they are NOT the sampling frame rates according to the present claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are fully patentable over the cited art, whether that art is taken individually or in combination.

As also discussed at the interview, the Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to U.S. Patent Nos. 5,708,845, and related 6,496,981; and to related U.S. Patent Application No. 09/815,020 (US 20020056136), all to Wistendahl, et al. Each of these documents discloses structure and function for mapping "hot spots" in media content. These documents are cited in a concurrently-filed Information Disclosure Statement.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 625-3507. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By: /Richard P. Bauer/
Attorney for Applicants
Richard P. Bauer
Registration No. 31,588

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.
East Lobby: Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201
Telephone: (312) 902-5200
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061